

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 6-11, 13-17 and 19-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 11, 13, 17 and 19 are amended. Claims 2, 4-5, 12 and 18 have been canceled. Claims 21-23 are added as new. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed and specifically at claims 12 and 18 as well as page 6, line 26 to page 8, line 8 of Applicant's specification. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

Applicant has amended the specification for clarification. No new matter has been added.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10-13 and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gleeson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,989). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claim 1 for clarification. Claim 1 is directed to a process for determining whether to permit a multicast user to join in a multicast group. Claim 1 recites "if the multicast user corresponds a multicast authority and the multicast group address carried in the request packet matches a multicast group address corresponding to the multicast authority of the multicast user among the mapping relation between multicast authorities and multicast group addresses, permitting the multicast user to use

the requested multicast service, otherwise, prohibiting the multicast user from using the request multicast service.”

Gleeson appears to show two association relations. One association relation is an association relation between the group destination address and the combination of virtual local area network (VLAN) designations and physical interface number, wherein each VLAN designation is configured to identify one VLAN on which at least one subscribing entity resides. (Please see table 308 in FIG.3 and col. 3, line 67-col.4, line 1.) The other association relation is a MVLAN ID and VLAN designation, wherein each MVLAN ID corresponding to a plurality of VLAN designations so that only one copy of (multicast) messages is created and forwarded along the plurality of VLAN designations. (Please see table 312 in FIG.3 and col. 10, line 57-64.)

In contrast, claim 1 recites “wherein the mapping relation between address information of multicast users and multicast authorities defines that at least one multicast user each corresponds to different multicast authorities and at least one multicast authority each corresponds to many multicast users, wherein the mapping relation between multicast authorities and multicast group addresses defines that at least one multicast authority each corresponds to a plurality of multicast programs which can be accessed by at least one multicast user.” In other words, claim 1 requires authority relationships which are set to determine whether a multicast user who requests to join in a multicast group is permitted to use requested multicast service.

Gleeson at best shows that an association relation between the MVLAN ID and all VLAN destinations rather than an association relation between MVLAN ID and a plurality of Multicast group addresses should be set in a multicast network device

(MND). In Gleeson, the MVLAN ID encompasses all VLAN designations of the entities (col. 8, lines 59-61), and the VLAN designation is a color, such as red, blue, green, etc (fig. 2B, table 240). So, in Gleeson, the MVLAN ID is the combination of VLAN designations, such as, blue-green, red-blue, etc (fig. 3, table 312).

In contrast, claim 1 requires a mapping relation between multicast authorities and multicast group addresses is preset in a network equipment and in the mapping relation between multicast authorities and multicast group addresses, at least one multicast authority each corresponds to a plurality of multicast programs which can be accessed by at least one multicast user. Thus, the MVLAN IDs relations in Gleeson differ from the claimed multicast authority relations.

Furthermore, the association relation in table 308 is different from the mapping relation between address information of multicast users and multicast authorities in claim 1. Particularly, the association relation in table 308 of FIG. 3 at best only has an association relation between group destination address and a combination of subscribing entities (without VLAN designations) and physical interface number or an association relation between group destination address and a combination of subscribing VLAN designations and physical interface number. It does not disclose an association relation between MVLAN ID and multicast users.

Thus, Gleeson does not disclose the above distinguishing features of claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 defines over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 11 and 17 each recite features similar to the above distinguishing features of claim 1 and, thus, also define over the art cited by the Examiner.

Claims 3, 6-10 13-17, and 19-23 each respectively depend from claims 1, 11, or 17 and, thus, also define over the art cited by the Examiner.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gleeson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,989) in view of Hayashi (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0147392).

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gleeson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,989) in view of Huang et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,683,887).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that the arguments presented above with respect to claim 1 apply here equally. Further, the other cited references fail to cure the deficiencies of Gleeson.

Thus, Applicant submits that claims 9 and 14 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 21-23 are new. Applicant believes the new claims also define over the art cited by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 1, 2010

By: /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/tlp
15341467.1